arXiv:1610.01938v1 [math.PR] 6 Oct 2016

Absence of percolation for Poisson outdegree-one graphs

October 7, 2016

David Coupier, David Dereudre and Simon Le Stum
Laboratoire paul Painlevé, University Lille 1

Abstract

A Poisson outdegree-one graph is an oriented graph based on a Poisson point process such that each vertex has only one outgoing edge. The paper focuses on the absence of percolation for such graphs. Our main result is based on two assumptions. The Shield assumption ensures that the graph is locally determined with possible random horizons. The Loop assumption ensures that any forward branch of the graph merges on a loop provided that the Poisson point process is augmented with a finite collection of well-chosen points. Several models satisfy these general assumptions and inherit in consequence the finite cluster property. In particular, we solve in Theorem 3.1 a conjecture by Daley et al. on the absence of percolation for the line-segment model (Conjecture 7.1 of [3], discussed in [6] as well). In this planar model, a segment is growing from any point of the Poisson process and stops its growth whenever it hits another segment. The random directions are picked independently and uniformly on the unit disk. Another model of geometric navigation is presented and also fulfills the Shield and Loop assumptions (Theorem 3.2).

Keywords. Continuum Percolation; Geometric Random Graph; Germ-grain Model; Lilypond Model; Line-segment Model; Navigation Model.

1 Introduction

Consider the classical nearest neighbour graph based on a planar homogeneous Poisson point process in which each point is simply connected to its nearest neighbour. The absence of percolation for this model is due to the fact that almost surely a homogeneous Poisson point process does not have descending chain. By a descending chain, we mean an infinite sequence $x_1, x_2, ...$ of points of the process for which $|x_{i-1} - x_i| \geq |x_i - x_{i+1}|$ for all $i \geq 2$. Daley and Last have showed in [4] that the absence of percolation for the lilypond model can also be obtained as a consequence of the descending chain argument. In this model a ball is growing with unit rate from any Poisson point and stops its growth when it hits another ball. Note that the finite cluster property for this model has first been proved in [5].

When the growing balls are replaced with growing segments the issue is much more complicated and have been formulated by Daley et al. in [3]. This line-segment model is defined via a marked homogeneous Poisson point process $\mathbb{X}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0; 1]$ where the marks are independent

and uniformly distributed on $[0;1]$. At time 0, for any $(\xi, u) \in \mathbb{X}$ a line-segment centred at ξ starts to grow at unit rate in the direction πu. Each line-segment ceases to grow when one of its ends hits another segment. Remark that the descending chain argument does not work in this setting. Indeed, when a line-segment hits another one, there is no reason that the hit segment is smaller than the hitting one. Nevertheless the absence of percolation was conjectured by Daley et al. (Conjecture 7.1 of [3]) and was still unproven until this present paper. We state the finite cluster property for this line-segment model as a consequence of our main result (Theorem 3.1).

It is easy to interpret the outdegree-one models mentioned above as (Poisson) outdegree-one graphs. For the stopped germ-grain models (as lilypond and line-segment models), an oriented edge from x to y is declared when the grain from x hits the grain from y. For this reason our main result, presented in the general setting of Poisson outdegree-one graph, covers naturally the geometrical setting. Since the graph is oriented, we can define the Forward and Backward sets of any given vertex x: see Figure 1 for an illustration and Section 2.2 for a precise definition. Then, the cluster containing x merely is the union of these both sets. See the book of Penrose for a very complete reference on geometric random graphs [10].



Figure 1: Here is a picture of the cluster of a given vertex x. The gray vertices belong to the Forward set of x whereas the white ones are in its Backward set.

Thanks to the outdegree-one structure, a forward branch is finite if and only if it contains a loop. By a loop, we mean an finite sequence $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ of different vertices for which x_i is connected to x_{i+1} for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and x_n is connected to x_1. In Figure 1, the Forward set of x contains a loop of size 4. A general argument for stationary outdregree-one graphs, called mass transport principle, ensures that the absence of forward percolation implies the absence of backward percolation. Henceforth, the aim of our work is to provide general assumptions ensuring that any forward branch of Poisson outdegree-one graphs merges on a loop. This conjecture is supported by the following heuristic: there are many loops everywhere in the plane and it is too difficult for an infinite forward branch to avoid all of them.

In [6] Hirsch proposes such assumptions in the setting of geometrical graphs. In particular, the author proved the conjecture by Daley et al. for a one-sided line-segment model for which the growing directions are piked uniformly among the 4 fixed directions North, East, South and West. It is a hard and exigent work to check that this model satisfy the general technical assumptions given by Hirsch. In the original line-segment model with directions chosen uniformly on $[0;\pi]$, the verification seems likely impossible as says the author himself in Section 6. Our

main contribution is to provide simpler assumptions which ensure the absence of percolation for a large class of models, containing at least the original line-segment model.

The proof of our main theorem is based on the following general statement for Poisson outdegree-one graphs which can be interpreted as a counterpart of the mass transport principle. If there exists, with positive probability, an infinite forward branch then the expectation of the size of a typical backward branch is infinite. Therefore the challenge was to exhibit minimal assumptions which guaranty that such expectation is finite. As far as we know, this strategy has never been investigated before. Let us describe briefly both assumptions of our main theorem. The first one, called the Shield assumption, is directly inspired from the ones by Hirsch (see Secton 3 of [6]). More or less, it assumes that with high probability, the graph contains no edge crossing large boxes. The second one, called the Loop assumption, assumes that any forward branch merges to a loop if the process is augmented with a finite collection of well-chosen points (without reducing the size of the backward). Roughly speaking, this assumption assures that a loop is possible along a forward branch provided that some points are added. In general this fact is obvious for all models for which the loops are possible. The extra condition on the size of the backward is directly related to the method we use. This condition seems a bit artificial and could be probably relaxed in the future. However we note that it is relatively easy to check in all models we met.

As mentioned before our main application is the absence of percolation for the line-segment model introduced by Daley et al. We investigate also another model which is inspired by the geometrical navigation defined in [1]. See Theorem 3.2.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a precise description of Poisson outdegree-one models and give examples. In Section 3, we formulate our two assumptions and the main result (Theorem 3.1) ensuring the absence of percolation. Section 4 is devoted to its proof and finally, in Section 5, we check that both models introduced in Section 2 satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.1.

2 General model and examples

2.1 Notations

All the models of this paper take place in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. The configuration space $\mathscr{C}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with marks in $[0;1]$ is defined by

$$\mathscr{C} = \Big\{ \varphi \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1] \,;\, N_\Lambda(\varphi) < \infty, \text{ for any bounded } \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d \Big\}$$

where $N_\Lambda(\varphi) = \#(\varphi \cap (\Lambda \times [0,1]))$ denotes the number of marked points of φ whose first ordinate lies in Λ. Any other choice of compact set for the marks could be considered with slight modifications in the following. Let us denote by φ_{germs} the projection of any given configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}$ onto $\mathbb{R}^d$: $\varphi_{germs} = \{\xi \,;\, (\xi, \cdot) \in \varphi\}$. For a given subset Λ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}$, φ_Λ denotes the set of points of φ included in $\Lambda \times [0;1]$: $\varphi_\Lambda = \{(\xi, u) \in \varphi \;;\; \xi \in \Lambda\}$.

As usual, the configuration space $\mathscr{C}$ is equipped with the σ-algebra

$$\mathscr{S} = \sigma\Big(P_{(A,n)} \,;\, A \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1],\, n \geq 0 \Big) \,,$$

generated by the counting functions $P_{(A,n)} = \{\varphi \in \mathscr{C}; \#(\varphi \cap A) \leq n\}$. Similarly, for a any subset

$\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the σ-algebra of events in Λ by

$$\mathscr{S}_\Lambda = \sigma\Big(P_{(A,n)}\,;\, A \subset \Lambda \times [0;1],\, n \geq 0\Big)\ .$$

Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The translation operator τ_v acts on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1]$ and $\mathscr{C}$ as follows: for any $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $x = (\xi, u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1]$ and $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}$, we set $\tau_v(w) = v + w$, $\tau_v(x) = (\xi + v, u)$ and $\tau_v(\varphi) = \cup_{x\in\varphi}\{\tau_v(x)\}$. Finally, a subset $\mathscr{C}' \subset \mathscr{C}$ is said translation invariant whenever $\tau_v(\mathscr{C}') \subset \mathscr{C}'$, for any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

2.2 The outdegree-one model

In our setting, an *outdegree-one graph* is an oriented graph whose vertex set is given by a configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}$ and having exactly one outgoing edge per vertex. Such graph can be described by a *graph function* which determines, for any vertex, its outgoing neighbour. Note that the marks in $[0;1]$ will be used as random contributions to this connection mechanism. See examples in Section 2.4.

Definition 2.1 *Let $\mathscr{C}' \subset \mathscr{C}$ be a translation invariant set. A function h from $\mathscr{C}' \times (\mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1])$ to $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1]$ is called a* ***graph function*** *if:*

(i) $\forall \varphi \in \mathscr{C}', \forall x \in \varphi,\ h(\varphi, x) \in \varphi \backslash \{x\}$;

(ii) $\forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall \varphi \in \mathscr{C}', \forall x \in \varphi,\ h(\tau_v(\varphi), \tau_v(x)) = \tau_v(h(\varphi, x))$.

The couple $(\mathscr{C}', h)$ is then called an ***outdegree-one model****.*

In the sequel, let us consider an outdegree-one model $(\mathscr{C}', h)$ and a configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$. The associated graph is made up of edges $(x, h(\varphi, x))$, for all $x \in \varphi$. Let us remark that this graph is not necessarily planar.

Let us describe the clusters of this graph. Let $x \in \varphi$. The *Forward set* $\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi)$ of x in φ is defined as the sequence of the outgoing neighbours starting at x:

$$\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi) = \{x, h(\varphi, x), h(\varphi, h(\varphi, x)), \ldots\}\ .$$

The Forward set $\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi)$ is a branch of the graph, possibly infinite. The *Backward set* $\mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi)$ of x in φ contains all the vertices $y \in \varphi$ having x in their Forward set:

$$\mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi) = \{y \in \varphi\,;\, x \in \mathrm{For}(y, \varphi)\}\ .$$

The Backward set $\mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi)$ admits a tree structure whose x is the root. The Forward and Backward sets of x may overlap; they (at least) contain x. Their union forms the *Cluster* of x in φ:

$$C(x, \varphi) = \mathrm{For}(x, \varphi) \cup \mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi)\ .$$

Our main theorem (Theorem 3.1) states that for a large class of random models, all the clusters are a.s. finite. In particular, it is not difficult to observe that the Forward set $\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi)$ is finite if and only if it contains a *loop*, i.e. a subset $\{y_1, \ldots, y_l\} \subset \mathrm{For}(x, \varphi)$, with $l \geq 2$, such that for any $1 \leq i \leq l$, $h(\varphi, y_i) = y_{i+1}$ (where the index $i + 1$ is taken modulo l). In this case, the integer l is called the *size* of the loop. Furthermore, the outdegree-one property implies that there is at most one loop in a cluster. Hence, a finite cluster is made up of one loop with some finite trees rooted at vertices of the loop (see Figure 1). Obviously, this notion of loops will be central in our study.

2.3 Random outdegree-one model

Let Q be a probability measure on $[0;1]$ such $Q(\theta) > 0$ for any open set θ in $[0;1]$ and let us denote by λ_d the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We consider a Poisson point process (PPP) $\mathbb{X}$ on $\mathscr{C}$ with intensity $\lambda_d \otimes Q$. This means that the random variable $\#(\mathbb{X} \cap A)$ follows a Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda_d \otimes Q(A)$, for any bounded set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1]$. By a standard change of scale, any other (stationary) intensity measure of the form $z\lambda_d \otimes Q$ with $z > 0$ could be considered. The process $\mathbb{X}$ can also be interpreted as a stationary PPP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with intensity one in which all the Poisson points are independently marked with distribution Q, and such that the marks are also independent of the locations of the Poisson points. For the two examples considered in this work (see Section 2.4), Q is the uniform distribution on $[0;1]$. But other mark distributions could be foreseen: this will be discussed in Section 3.

Finally, let us denote by $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space on which the PPP $\mathbb{X}$ is defined.

Definition 2.2 *Let $(\mathscr{C}', h)$ be an outdegree-one model. If $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X} \in \mathscr{C}') = 1$ then the triplet $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ is called a* ***random outdegree-one model****.*

2.4 Two examples

Let Q be the uniform distribution on $[0;1]$.

2.4.1 The line-segment model



Figure 2: Here is a simulation of the line-segment model which has been realized by F. Noyez. Different clusters are drawn with different colors. In the North-East quadrant, the (small) dark blue cluster contains a loop of size 5 whereas the (large, with 23 vertices) light green cluster contains a loop of size 3. Besides, in the line-segment model, 3 is the minimal size of a loop.

Our first model is a unilateral version of the model studied in [3] (called *Model 1* therein) and mentioned in Section 1. It is also a generalization of the model studied in [6].

The *line-segment model* is based on a stopping germ-grain protocol defined as follows. Let us consider a marked configuration φ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0;1]$. At the same time (say $t = 0$), for any marked point $(\xi, u) \in \varphi$, an half line-segment starts growing (at unit rate) from ξ according to the direction $2\pi u$. Each line-segment ceases to grow whenever its end point hits another line-segment. But the stopping one continues its growth. A simulation of this model is given in Figure 2.

Let us denote by $\mathscr{C}'$ the configuration space for which the above dynamic is well defined. This means that each line-segment is eventually stopped by only another one line-segment. Of course, the set $\mathscr{C}'$ is translation invariant. We can then define a graph function h encoding the line-segment model: given $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and $x \in \varphi$, the image $h(\varphi, x)$ refers to the stopping line-segment of x. This construction clearly provides an outdegree-one graph.

The authors in [3] proved that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X} \in \mathscr{C}') = 1$. Therefore, according to Definition 2.2, $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ is a random outdegree-one model.

2.4.2 The navigation model



Figure 3: Here is a scheme of the navigation model. Remark that in the navigation model, two marked points suffice to form a loop.

Let us define the *navigation model* introduced in [1]. Let $\epsilon \in (0;\pi]$ be an extra parameter and φ be a configuration in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0;1]$. Each marked point $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$ defines a semi-infinite cone with apex ξ, direction u and opening angle ϵ:

$$C(x) = \xi + \Big\{(r\cos(\alpha), r\sin(\alpha))\,;\, r > 0 \text{ and } |\alpha - 2\pi u| < \epsilon\Big\}\,.$$

In the navigation model, each marked point $x = (\xi, u)$ is connected to $(\xi', \cdot) \in \varphi$ where ξ' is the closest element to ξ living in the cone $C(x)$, i.e. such that

$$\|\xi - \xi'\|_2 = \min\Big\{\|\xi - \xi''\|_2\,;\, \xi'' \in C(x) \cap \varphi_{germs}\Big\}\,. \tag{1}$$

See Figure 3. Of course this connection procedure produces an outdegree-one graph provided those closest elements exist and are unique. Let us denote by $\mathscr{C}'$ the set of such configurations.

This is a translation invariant set. In this setting, $h(\varphi, x)$ is defined as the unique marked point $(\xi', \cdot)$ where ξ' satisfies (1).

Using standard properties of the PPP, it is easy to show that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X} \in \mathscr{C}') = 1$ and therefore $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ is a random outdegree-one model.

In the case where $\epsilon = \pi$, the marks have no longer importance and the navigation model actually coincides with the nearest neighbour graph.

3 Results

We first establish in Theorem 3.1 the absence of percolation for all random outdegree-ones $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ satisfying two general assumptions, namely the *Loop and Shield assumptions*, which are described and commented below. Thus, Theorem 3.2 asserts that the line-segment model and the navigation model verify these two assumptions and therefore do not percolate.

Loop assumption

The Loop assumption mainly expresses the possibility for any marked point $x \in \varphi$ to break its Forward set by adding a finite sequence of marked points $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ to the current configuration φ.

Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and k be a positive integer. The configuration φ is said *k-looping* if for any $x \in \varphi$, there exists an open ball $A_x \subset (\mathbb{R}^d \times [0;1])^k$ such that, for all $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in A_x$:

(i) $\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi \cup \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}) = \{x, x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$;

(ii) $\#\mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi \cup \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}) \geq \#\mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi)$.

Given x, conditions (i) and (ii) can be interpreted as a local modification of the configuration φ which breaks the Forward set of x without altering its Backward set– or at least without decreasing the cardinality of its Backward set. Whereas condition (i) is very natural to obtain a finite cluster, condition (ii) is more technical and will appear in the proof of Proposition 4.3. The choice of the integer k will be peculiar to the random outdegree-one $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$.

We will say that the random outdegree-one $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ satisfies the Loop assumption if there exists a positive integer k such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X} \text{ is } k\text{-looping }) = 1 \ .$$

Shield assumption

The Shield assumption is a kind of strong stabilizing property for the random outdegree-one $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ and has been first introduced in a slight different way in [6].

We will say that the random outdegree-one $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ satisfy the Shield assumption if there exist a positive integer α and a sequence of events $(\mathscr{E}_m)_{m \geq 1}$ such that:

(i) $\forall m \geq 1$, $\mathscr{E}_m \in \mathscr{S}_{[-\alpha m; \alpha m]^d}$;

(ii) $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{E}_m) \underset{m \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 1$;

(iii) Consider the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with edges given by $\{\{z, z'\}, |z - z'|_\infty = 1\}$ and any three disjoint subsets A_1, A_2, V of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\forall i = 1, 2$, the boundary $\partial A_i = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \backslash A_i, \exists z' \in A_i, |z - z'|_\infty = 1\}$ is included in V. Let us set

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \Big(A_i \oplus \Big[\frac{-1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}\Big]^d\Big) \setminus (V \oplus [-\alpha; \alpha]^d) \ .$$

Then, for all m and for any configurations $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathscr{C}'$ such that $\tau_{-mz}(\varphi) \in \mathscr{E}_m$ for all $z \in V$, the following holds:

$$\forall x \in \varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_1},\, h(\varphi, x) = h(\varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_2^c} \cup \varphi'_{m\mathcal{A}_2}, x)\ . \tag{2}$$

In Condition (*iii*), the set mV acts as an uncrossable obstacle, i.e. a shield, between sets $m\mathcal{A}_1$ and $m\mathcal{A}_2$. See Figure 4. Equation (2) says that the outgoing neighbour of any $x \in \varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_1}$ does not depend on the configuration on $m\mathcal{A}_2$. In particular, $h(\varphi, x) \in \varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_2^c}$.



Figure 4: To simplify the picture, we have chosen $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ so that $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i \oplus [\frac{-1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}]^d)$, $\forall i = 1, 2$. The wight points are the elements of mV while the black ones are those of $m\mathcal{A}_1$ (inside mV) and $m\mathcal{A}_2$ (outside mV). Red squares are points of φ. If $\tau_{-mz}(\varphi) \in \mathscr{E}_m$ for all $z \in V$, then it is impossible for a (red) segment $[\xi; \xi']$, where $x = (\xi, \cdot)$ and $h(\varphi, x) = (\xi', \cdot)$, to cross the set $m(V \oplus [-\alpha; \alpha]^d)$ from $m\mathcal{A}_1$ to $m\mathcal{A}_2$– or from $m\mathcal{A}_2$ to $m\mathcal{A}_1$ by symmetry of Equation (2) w.r.t. indexes 1 and 2.

Here is our main results.

Theorem 3.1 *Any random outdegree-one $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ satisfying the Loop and Shield assumptions does not percolate with probability* 1*:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\, \#C(x, \mathbb{X}) < \infty) = 1\ .$$

Theorem 3.1 is proved in Section 4 and a sketch is given in Section 4.1.
Checking that both models of Section 2.4 satisfy the Loop and Shield assumptions, we get:

Theorem 3.2 *The line-segment model and the navigation model do not percolate with probability* 1*.*

The choice of a suitable integer k such that the random outdegree-one $(\mathscr{C}', h, \mathbb{X})$ satisfies the Loop assumption actually depends on the model. Hence, 3 marked points suffice to make a loop for the line-segment model and only 1 for the navigation model: see respectively Propositions 5.1 and 5.5.

Any variant of the line-segment model or the navigation model in which the uniform distribution Q is replaced with a probability measure Q' defined by

$$Q'(A) = \int_A f(x)Q(dx) \ ,$$

where f is a positive function on $[0;1]$, has to satisfy the Loop and Shield assumptions. But this is not true when f is null over $[1/3;1]$ and $\epsilon < \pi/6$: in this case, the model is in some sense directed. Besides, let us remark that the navigation model with $Q = \delta_{(1,0)^-}$ the Dirac measure on $(1,0)$ –and $\epsilon = \pi/2$ coincides with the Directed Spannig Forest with direction $(1,0)$. Obviously, the Loop assumption does not hold in this latter case. Indeed, a semi-infinite path starts at each vertex: see for example [2].
The law of the size of a typical cluster living in a fixed model which satisfies the two assumptions would be an interesting further result. It is also possible to investigate asymptotics of the number of different clusters on expanding windows. In the case of the lilypond model some results of this kind have been established in [8].

4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

4.1 Sketch of the proof

We have to prove that any random outdegree-one model which satisfies the Loop and Shield assumptions, does not contain any infinite cluster with probability 1:

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\ \#\mathrm{For}(x,\mathbb{X}) < \infty \ \text{ and } \ \#\mathrm{Back}(x,\mathbb{X}) < \infty) = 1 \ . \tag{3}$$

First, thanks to a standard mass transport argument, we can reduce the proof of the absence of percolation to the absence of forward percolation (Proposition 4.1 of Section 4.2):

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\ \#\mathrm{For}(x,\mathbb{X}) < \infty) = 1 \implies \mathbb{P}(\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\ \#\mathrm{Back}(x,\mathbb{X}) < \infty) = 1 \ . \tag{4}$$

Then, we proceed by absurd and assume that, with positive probability, an infinite forward branch starts at a typical marked point Θ:

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\mathrm{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) = \infty) > 0 \ , \tag{5}$$

In all the rest of this paper, we set $\Theta = (0,U)$ where U is an uniform random variable in $[0;1]$, and $\mathbb{X}_\Theta$ denotes the configuration $\mathbb{X} \cup \{\Theta\}$. In Sections 4.3 and 4.4, are respectively introduced the notions of *looping points* and *almost looping points*. To sum up, a looping point admits a finite Forward set, i.e. a forward branch ending with a loop, and an almost looping point is set to become a looping point by adding some suitable marked points. Combining the Loop and Shield assumptions, we prove in Proposition 4.4 of Section 4.5 that (5) forces the infinite branch $\mathrm{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)$ to contain an infinite number of almost looping points:

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\{y \in \mathrm{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ y \text{ is an almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\} = \infty) > 0 \ . \tag{6}$$

Heuristically, such event should not occur since it produces an infinite number of opportunities to break the branch by adding points. Precisely, Proposition 4.5 of Section 4.6 allows to convert the forward result (6) to a backward one. Precisely,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is an almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\big] = \infty \ . \tag{7}$$

By adding some suitable marked points, it follows from (7) that the mean size of the Backward set of a typical looping point is infinite (see Proposition 4.3 of Section 4.4):

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\big] = \infty \ . \tag{8}$$

This actually is the only place where the condition (ii) of the Loop assumption is used. Finally, another use of the mass transport principle (Proposition 4.2 of Section 4.3) makes statement (8) impossible. This contradiction achieves the proof.

4.2 Absence of backward percolation

Using the mass transport principle (Lemma 4.1), we show that the backward percolation is impossible whenever the forward percolation does not occur. This standard argument is used p.18 of [7] and p.4 of [6].

Proposition 4.1 *The following implication holds:*

$$\mathbb{P}\big[\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\, \#For(x, \mathbb{X}) < \infty\big] = 1 \implies \mathbb{P}\big[\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\, \#Back(x, \mathbb{X}) < \infty\big] = 1 \ .$$

Let us consider a configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and a bounded subset Λ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. A marked point $x \in \varphi$ is said *looping inside* Λ (for φ) if its Forward set $\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi)$ contains a loop $\{y_1, \ldots, y_l\}$, i.e. for any $1 \le i \le l$, $h(\varphi, y_i) = y_{i+1}$ (where the index $i+1$ is taken modulo l), and the center of mass of the set $\{y_1, \ldots, y_l\}$ belongs to Λ. Thus, for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let us define the following set:

$$Q_z(\varphi) = \Big\{x \in \varphi;\ x \text{ is looping inside } z \oplus \Big[\frac{-1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}\Big]^d\Big\} \ .$$

Lemma 4.1 *Let $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\#Q_z(\mathbb{X})] < \infty$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.1 is based on the mass transport principle.

Proof:[of Lemma 4.1.] By stationarity, it is enough to prove that $\mathbb{E}[\#Q_0(\mathbb{X})]$ is finite. For $y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we denote by $Q_z^y(\mathbb{X})$ the elements $x \in Q_z(\mathbb{X})$ whose first ordinate is in $y \oplus \Big[\frac{-1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}\Big]^d$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\#Q_0(\mathbb{X})] &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}[\#Q_0^y(\mathbb{X})] \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}[\#Q_{-y}^0(\mathbb{X})] \end{aligned}$$

where the latter equality is due to the stationarity of the PPP $\mathbb{X}$ and the graph function h. Now, each cluster in $\mathbb{X}$ a.s. contains at most one loop. This means that

$$\text{a.s.} \quad \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \#Q_{-y}^0(\mathbb{X}) \le N_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^d}(\mathbb{X}) \ .$$

Since the PPP $\mathbb{X}$ has intensity 1, it follows $\mathbb{E}[\#Q_0(\mathbb{X})] \le 1$. □

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.1.

Proof:[of Proposition 4.1.] By absurd, let us assume that with positive probability there exists $x \in \mathbb{X}$ whose Backward set is infinite. By hypothesis, its Forward set a.s. contains a loop. So, we can find a deterministic $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\exists x \in \mathbb{X};\ \#\mathrm{Back}(x,\mathbb{X}) = \infty \text{ and } x \text{ is looping inside } z \oplus \Big[\frac{-1}{2};\frac{1}{2}\Big]^d\Big] > 0\ .$$

However, on the above event, the random set $Q_z(\mathbb{X})$ is infinite which leads to a contradiction with Lemma 4.1. □

4.3 Finite expectation for the Backward set of looping points

Let $x = (\xi, u)$ be a marked point and $r > 0$. In the sequel, we will use the notation $B(x,r)$ for the open Euclidean ball with center ξ and radius r, instead of $B(\xi, r)$.

Definition 4.1 *Let $r < R$ be some positive real numbers and K be a positive integer. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$. A marked point $x \in \varphi$ is said a (r,R,K)-looping point of φ if*

(i) $N_{B(x,R)}(\varphi) \le K$;

(ii) *x is looping inside the ball $B(x,r)$ (for φ).*

Hence, a looping point is a marked point whose the Forward set admits a localized loop (actually, only its center of mass is localized). Then, the mass transport principle (Lemma 4.1) applies: its Backward set has a finite mean size. See Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.2 *Any triplet (r,R,K) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\#\mathit{Back}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a } (r,R,K)\text{-looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\Big] < \infty\ . \tag{9}$$

Proof: Let $r < R$ be some positive real numbers and K be a positive integer. Let us pick $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that $D_1 \subset D_2$ where

$$D_1 = \bigcup_{\eta \in \left[\frac{-\epsilon}{2};\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right]^d} B(\eta, r) \text{ and } D_2 = \bigcap_{\eta \in \left[\frac{-\epsilon}{2};\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right]^d} B(\eta, R)\ .$$

Let $\mathscr{I}$ be the expectation in (9). Using the Mecke formula on the set $M = [\frac{-\epsilon}{2};\frac{\epsilon}{2}]^d \times [0;1]$, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^d}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x\in\mathbb{X}\cap M} \#\mathrm{Back}(x,\mathbb{X})\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(x,\mathbb{X}) \text{ is looping inside } B(x,r)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{N_{B(x,R)}(\mathbb{X})\le K\}}\right] \\
&\le \frac{1}{\epsilon^d}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x\in\mathbb{X}\cap M} \#\mathrm{Back}(x,\mathbb{X})\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(x,\mathbb{X}) \text{ is looping inside } D_1\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{N_{D_2}(\mathbb{X})\le K\}}\right] \qquad (10) \\
&\le \frac{K}{\epsilon^d}\mathbb{E}\Big[\#\{y \in \mathbb{X};\ \mathrm{For}(y,\mathbb{X}) \text{ is looping inside } D_1\}\Big]\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

since each marked point y whose Forward set is looping inside D_1 is counting at most K times in the sum of (10). Thus, Lemma 4.1 allows to conclude. □

4.4 From almost looping points to looping points

Let us introduce the notion of almost looping points. The integer k below is given by the Loop assumption.

Definition 4.2 *Let us consider real numbers $0 < r < R$, a positive integer K, an open ball $A \subset (B(0,r) \times [0;1])^k$ and a configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$. A marked point $x \in \varphi$ is said a (r,R,K,A)-almost looping point of φ if:*

(i) $N_{B(x,R)}(\varphi) \leq K$;

(ii) $\forall (x_1,\dots,x_k) \in A_x$, *we have:*

(ii-a) $For(x, \varphi \cup \{x_1,\dots,x_k\}) = \{x, x_1,\dots,x_k\}$;

(ii-b) $\#Back(x, \varphi \cup \{x_1,\dots,x_k\}) \geq \#Back(x,\varphi)$;

where $A_x = \tau_\xi(A)$ with $x = (\xi,\cdot)$.

In other words, a (r,R,K,A)-almost looping point x of φ becomes a $(r,R,K+k)$-looping point of $\varphi \cup \{x_1,\dots,x_k\}$ when the k marked points $x_1,\dots,x_k$ are added in A. The set A can be interpreted as a suitable region to break the Forward set of x.

Proposition 4.3 *If there exist parameters (r,R,K,A) such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\#Back(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)-\textbf{almost looping point} \text{ for } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\right] = \infty \tag{11}$$

then,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\#Back(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a } (r,R,K+k)-\textbf{looping point} \text{ for } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\right] = \infty\ . \tag{12}$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 4.3. Let us first state a technical lemma which will be proved later.

Lemma 4.2 *Let Λ be a bounded Borelian of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with positive Lebesgue measure. Let us denote by U the uniform distribution on Λ. Let us consider $(X_i)_{1\leq i\leq k}$ i.i.d. random vectors on $\Lambda \times [0;1]$ with distribution $U \otimes Q$ which are also independent with $\mathbb{X}$. Let us set $\mathbb{X}' = \mathbb{X} \cup \{X_1,\dots,X_k\}$ the extended point process. Then the law Π' of $\mathbb{X}'$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law Π of $\mathbb{X}$ (i.e. the Poisson Point distribution) with density*

$$\frac{\Pi'(d\varphi)}{\Pi(d\varphi)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_d(\Lambda)^k} N_\Lambda(\varphi)\left(N_\Lambda(\varphi)-1\right)\dots\left(N_\Lambda(\varphi)-k+1\right)\ . \tag{13}$$

Proof:[of Proposition 4.3.] Let a quadruplet (r,R,K,A) such that (11) occurs. Our goal is to prove that the expectation in (12), denoted by $\mathscr{I}$, is infinite. Lemma 4.2 applied to the set $\Lambda = B(0,R)$ allows to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I} &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta) \text{ is looping inside } B(0,r)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{k\leq N_{B(0,R)}(\mathbb{X})\leq K+k\}}\right] \\
&= \int_{\mathscr{C}'} \#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta,\varphi_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(\Theta,\varphi_\Theta) \text{ is looping inside } B(0,r)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{k\leq N_{B(0,R)}(\varphi)\leq K+k\}}\Pi(d\varphi) \\
&= \int_{\mathscr{C}'} \#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta,\varphi_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(\Theta,\varphi_\Theta) \text{ is looping inside } B(0,r)\}}1_{\{k\leq N_{B(0,R)}(\varphi)\leq K+k\}}\frac{\Pi'(d\varphi)}{f(\varphi)}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $f(\varphi)$ is the density given in (13). Provided $k \leq N_{B(0,R)}(\mathbb{X}) \leq K+k$, the ratio $1/f(\varphi)$ is larger than some constant $C>0$. It follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I} &\geq C\int_{\mathscr{C}'} \#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta,\varphi_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(\Theta,\varphi_\Theta)\text{ is looping inside }B(0,r)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{k\leq N_{B(0,R)}(\varphi)\leq K+k\}}\Pi'(d\varphi)\\
&\geq \frac{C}{(U\otimes Q)^k(\Lambda)}\int_A \mathbb{E}\Big[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta\cup\{x_1,\ldots,x_k\})\\
&\qquad\times\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{For}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta\cup\{x_1,\ldots,x_k\})\text{ is looping inside }B(0,r)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{N_{B(0,R)}(\mathbb{X})\leq K\}}\Big](U\otimes Q)^k[dx_1\ldots dx_k]\\
&\geq \frac{C(U\otimes Q)^k(A)}{(U\otimes Q)^k(\Lambda)}\mathbb{E}\left[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}\!\!\!\!\not\;\;_{\{\Theta\text{ is a }(r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of }\mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

which is infinite by hypothesis. This concludes the proof. It is worth pointing out here that the condition (*ii-b*) is used to obtain the latter inequality. □

Proof:[of Lemma 4.2.] Outside the set Λ both processes $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{X}'$ are identically distributed and independent w.r.t. the processes inside Λ. Therefore, it is sufficient to check the absolute continuity on Λ. Let g be a bounded, measurable function. First, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Pi_\Lambda}\left[g(\mathbb{X}_\Lambda)\right]=\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_d(\Lambda)}\lambda_d(\Lambda)^l}{l!}\int_{(\Lambda\times[0;1])^l} g(\{y_1,\ldots,y_l\})(U\otimes Q)^l[dy_1\ldots dy_l]\ .$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\Pi'_\Lambda}\left[g(\mathbb{X}'_\Lambda)\right] &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_d(\Lambda)}\lambda_d(\Lambda)^l}{l!}\int_{(\Lambda\times[0;1])^{k+l}} g(\{x_1,\ldots,x_k\}\cup\{y_1,\ldots,y_l\})\\
&\qquad\qquad\times(U\otimes Q)^{k+l}[dx_1\ldots dx_k dy_1\ldots dy_l]\\
&= \sum_{m=k}^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_d(\Lambda)}\lambda_d(\Lambda)^{m-k}}{(m-k)!}\int_{(\Lambda\times[0;1])^m} g(\{x_1,\ldots,x_m\})(U\otimes Q)^m[dx_1\ldots dx_m]\\
&= \sum_{m=k}^{\infty}\frac{m(m-1)\ldots(m-k+1)}{\lambda_d(\Lambda)^k}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_d(\Lambda)}\lambda_d(\Lambda)^m}{m!}\\
&\qquad\qquad\times\int_{(\Lambda\times[0;1])^m} g(\{x_1,\ldots,x_m\})(U\otimes Q)^m[dx_1\ldots dx_m]
\end{aligned}$$

which provides the expected density written in (13). □

4.5 Existence of an infinite branch of almost looping points

Here is the main result of this section. Its proof uses intensively the Loop and Shiel assumptions.

Proposition 4.4 *If the probability $\mathbb{P}(\#For(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)=\infty)$ is positive then, there exists a quadruplet (r,R,K,A) such that:*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\#\{y\in For(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ y\ is\ a\ (r,R,K,A)\text{-}almost\ looping\ point\ of\ \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}=\infty\Big)>0\ . \qquad (14)$$

First, let us slightly modify the sequence $(\mathscr{E}_m)_{m\geq 1}$ given by the Shield assumption. Clearly, there exist a sequence of integers $(K_m)_{m\geq 1}$ and a sequence of positive real numbers $(\delta_m)_{m\geq 1}$ such that the event

$$\mathscr{E}'_m = \mathscr{E}_m \cap \{\forall x \in \mathbb{X}_{B(0,\alpha m)},\, \mathrm{rad}(A_x) > \delta_m\} \cap \{N_{B(0,\alpha m)}(\mathbb{X}) \leq K_m\} \tag{15}$$

has a probability tending to 1 as m tends to infinity. Specify that $\mathrm{rad}(A_x)$ denotes the radius of the open ball A_x given by the Loop assumption.

We need to introduce some definitions.

Definition 4.3 *Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and $m \geq 1$. A vertex $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is said m-shield for φ if $\tau_{-mz}(\varphi) \in \mathscr{E}'_m$.*

Definition 4.4 *Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and $m \geq 1$. A vertex $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is said m-protecting for φ if for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\|y - z\|_\infty \in \{0, 2\alpha, 4\alpha, \ldots, 2k\alpha\}$ (where α is given by the Shield assumption) then y is m-shield for φ. Moreover, a marked point $x \in \varphi$ is said m-protected in φ if there exists a m-protecting vertex $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ for φ such that x belongs to $(mz \oplus [-\alpha m; \alpha m]^d) \times [0; 1]$.*

Roughly speaking, a m-protecting vertex z is surrounded by k circles (w.r.t. the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$-norm) made up of m-shield vertices. Therefore this is also true for a m-protected marked point x. Thanks to the Shield assumption, each of these circles constitutes an uncrossable obstacle for a single edge $(x, h(\varphi, x))$. See Figure 4. This leads to the following result.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and $m \geq 1$. Let us consider a marked point $x \in \varphi$ which is m-protected in φ by some $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then, the set A_x given by the Loop assumption is included in $((mz \oplus [-\alpha(2k+1)m; \alpha(2k+1)m]^d) \times [0; 1])^k$.*

Proof: The Loop assumption asserts that any k-uplet $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ chosen in A_x added to the configuration φ provides $\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi \cup \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}) = \{x, x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$. So, it suffices to prove that the x_i's are included in $((mz \oplus [-\alpha(2k+1)m; \alpha(2k+1)m]^d) \times [0; 1])^k$.

By absurd, we suppose that there exist $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in A_x$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that x_i is localised outside of $((mz \oplus [-\alpha(2k+1)m; \alpha(2k+1)m]^d) \times [0; 1])^k$. Then there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, k\},\ x_i \notin \bigcup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d;\ \|y-z\|_\infty = 2\alpha j} ((my \oplus [-\alpha m; \alpha m]^d) \times [0; 1]).$$

Applying the shield assumption for the set $V = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d;\ \|y - z\|_\infty = 2\alpha j\}$ and noting that each vertex of V is still a shield vertex for the configuration $\varphi \cup \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$, we obtain that the set $\bigcup_{y \in V}(my \oplus [-\alpha m; \alpha m]^d)$ can not be cross by an edge of the graph built on $\varphi \cup \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$. It is in contradiction with

$$\begin{aligned}
&a) \quad x \in (mz \oplus [-\alpha m; \alpha m]^d) \times [0; 1],\\
&b) \quad x_i \notin (mz \oplus [-\alpha(2k+1)m; \alpha(2k+1)m]^d) \times [0; 1],\\
&c) \quad \mathrm{For}(x, \varphi \cup \{x_1, .., x_k\}) = \{x, x_1, .., x_k\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Let us now prove that the number of protected marked points in a typical forward branch is infinite with positive probability.

Lemma 4.4 *Assume that* $\mathbb{P}(\#For(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)=\infty)>0$. *Then there exists an integer* m_0 *such that, for all* $m\geq m_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\#\{x\in For(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ x\ is\ m\text{-}protected\ in\ \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}=\infty\Big)>0\ . \tag{16}$$

Proof: We first show that, for m sufficiently large, the subset of m-protecting vertices percolates in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with probability 1. Indeed, since the probability of $\mathscr{E}'_m$ goes to 1 when m goes to infinity, the probability that a vertex z is m-protecting for $\mathbb{X}_\Theta$ goes to 1 as well. Moreover, $\mathscr{E}'_m$ is $\mathscr{S}_{[-\alpha m;\alpha m]^d}$-measurable. This implies that the event "z is m-protecting" only depends on the states of the vertices y such that $d(y,z)\leq 2(2k+1)\alpha$. Using a classic stochastic domination result due to Liggett et al [9], we get that the random field $(\mathbb{1}_{\{z \text{ is } m\text{-protecting}\}})_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ dominates an independent Bernoulli field with parameter $p(m)$ which tends to 1 as m tends to infinity. Now, this Bernoulli site percolation (on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ graph structure) percolates provided $p(m)$ is close to 1. As a consequence, there exists m_0 such that for all $m\geq m_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\text{the set of m-protecting vertices percolates in } \mathbb{Z}^d\Big)=1\ .$$

To conclude, it is enough to show that the infinite forward branch $\mathrm{For}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)$ goes through an infinite number of m-protecting vertices. This statement is due to the fact that each connected component of vertices which are not m-protecting is finite on the one hand. And, on the other hand, thanks to the Shield assumption it is forbidden to go from one such connected component (of vertices which are not m-protecting) to another one via a single edge. □

For the rest of this section, we choose $m\geq m_0$ where the integer m_0 is given by Lemma 4.4.

Remembering the sequence $(\delta_m)_{m\geq 1}$ of positive real numbers given in (15), we consider a finite covering of $([-\alpha(2k+1)m;\alpha(2k+1)m]^d\times[0;1])^k$ by open euclidean balls $\{\mathscr{K}_j, 1\leq j\leq j(m)\}$ of radii $\frac{\delta_m}{2}$. Then, the pigeonhole principle provides the next result:

Lemma 4.5 *Assume that* $\mathbb{P}(\#For(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta)=\infty)>0$. *There exists an index* $1\leq j_0\leq j(m)$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\#\{y\in For(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ \tau_y(\mathscr{K}_{j_0})\subset A_y\}=\infty\Big)>0\ .$$

Proof: For $1\leq j\leq j(m)$, let us set $\mathscr{Y}_j=\{\#\{y\in \mathrm{For}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta);\tau_y(\mathscr{K}_j)\subset A_y\}=\infty\}$. Thus, we assume that

$$\#\{x\in \mathrm{For}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ x \text{ is } m\text{-protected in } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}=\infty\ .$$

For any such marked point x, the set A_x is included in $((mz\oplus[-\alpha(2k+1)m;\alpha(2k+1)m]^d)\times[0;1])^k$ thanks to Lemma 4.3 (where $z=z(x)$ is the m-protecting vertex associated to x). Since z is itself m-shield (see Definition 4.4) then $\mathrm{rad}(A_x)$ is larger than δ_m. So A_x contains at least one $\tau_x(\mathscr{K}_j)$, for some (random) index $1\leq j\leq j(m)$. Hence, by Lemma 4.4, we get:

$$0<\mathbb{P}\Big(\#\{x\in \mathrm{For}(\Theta,\mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ x \text{ is } m\text{-protected in } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}=\infty\Big)\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{1\leq j\leq j(m)}\mathscr{Y}_j\right)\leq \sum_{1\leq j\leq j(m)}\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{Y}_j)\ .$$

The expected result follows. □

We are now able to conclude the proof of Proposition 4.4. Let j_0 be the index given in the previous lemma. Let us pick $0 < r < R$ such that

$$\mathscr{K}_{j_0} \subset (B(0,r) \times [0;1])^k \subset (B(0,R) \times [0;1])^k \subset ([-\alpha(2k+1)m; \alpha(2k+1)m]^d \times [0;1])^k \ .$$

Then, any marked point $y \in \mathrm{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)$ such that $\tau_y(\mathscr{K}_{j_0})$ is included in A_y is a (r, R, K, A)-almost looping point of $\mathbb{X}_\Theta$ with $A = \mathscr{K}_{j_0}$ and $K = (2k+1)^d K_m$. Remark that the parameters r, R, K and A are deterministic. By Lemma 4.5, the number of such marked points y is infinite with positive probability. This achieves the proof.

4.6 From Backward set to Forward set

In this last section, it is stated that the mean size of the Backward set of a typical almost looping point is infinite whenever the Forward set of a typical marked point contains an infinite number of almost looping points with positive probability. Above all, this result allows to convert a forward result to a backward one.

Proposition 4.5 *If there exist some parameters r, R, K, A such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\#\{y \in \mathit{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ y \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\} = \infty\Big) > 0 \ , \tag{17}$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\#\mathit{Back}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\right] = \infty \ . \tag{18}$$

Proof: Let us fix parameters r, R, K, A such that (17) holds. Let us denote by $\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)$ the subset of $\mathrm{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)$ made up of (r, R, K, A)-almost looping points:

$$\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) = \{y \in \mathrm{For}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta);\ y \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\} \ .$$

We need to bound from below the density of $\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)$. The next result will be proved at the end of the section.

Lemma 4.6 *There exists a function $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} g(n) = \infty$ and*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\forall n \geq 1,\ \#\Big(\mathit{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \cap ([-n;n]^d \times [0;1])\Big) \geq g(n)\Big) > 0 \ .$$

We will say that a marked point x is *dense* for $\mathbb{X}$ if for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\#\Big(\mathrm{For}^*(x, \mathbb{X}) \cap ([-n;n]^d \times [0;1])\Big) \geq g(n) \ .$$

Lemma 4.6 asserts that, with positive probability, Θ is dense in $\mathbb{X}_\Theta$.

Let $\Lambda_n = [-n;n]^d \times [0;1]$ for $n \geq 1$. The Campbell Mecke Formula allows to write:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{(4n)^d} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x \in \mathbb{X} \cap \Lambda_{2n}} \#\mathrm{Back}(x, \mathbb{X}) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}\}}\right] \ .$$

If the marked point $x \in \Lambda_n$ is dense for $\mathbb{X}$ then there exist at least $g(n)$ marked points in $\Lambda_{2n} \cap \mathbb{X}$ having x in their Backward sets. This is here that the passage from the Forward set to the Backward set happens. Henceforth,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\#\mathrm{Back}(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta)\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta \text{ is a } (r,R,K,A)\text{-almost looping point of } \mathbb{X}_\Theta\}}\right] &\geq \frac{g(n)}{(4n)^d}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x\in\Lambda_n\cap\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \text{ is dense for } \mathbb{X}\}}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^d} g(n)\mathbb{P}(\Theta \text{ is dense in } \mathbb{X}_\Theta).\end{aligned}$$

Let us tend n to infinity. By Lemma 4.6, (18) follows. □

Proof:[of Lemma 4.6] Let $(a_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers whose sum $\sum_n a_n$ equals $\alpha/2$ where $\alpha = \mathbb{P}(\#\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) = \infty) > 0$ by hypothesis. Thus, we define a (nondecreasing) sequence of integers $(n_k)_{k\geq 1}$ and a sequence of events $(B_k)_{k\geq 0}$ as follows. At first, let us define B_0 as the event $\{\#\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) = \infty\}$ and n_1 as the first integer n such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(B_0 \cap \Big\{\#\Big(\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \cap ([-n;n]^d \times [0;1])\Big) \geq 1\Big\}\Big) \geq \alpha - a_1 \ .$$

Since the above probability tends to α as n tends to infinity, n_1 is well defined. We also denote by B_1 the following event:

$$B_1 = B_0 \cap \Big\{\#\Big(\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \cap ([-n_1;n_1]^d \times [0;1])\Big) \geq 1\Big\} \ .$$

Thus, for any $k \geq 2$, we define by induction the integer n_k as the first integer n such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(B_{k-1} \cap \Big\{\#\Big(\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \cap ([-n;n]^d \times [0;1])\Big) \geq k\Big\}\Big) \geq \alpha - \sum_{1\leq i\leq k-1} a_i \ .$$

We also set

$$B_k = B_{k-1} \cap \Big\{\#\Big(\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \cap ([-n_k;n_k]^d \times [0;1])\Big) \geq k\Big\} \ .$$

Finally, let us define a function g by $g(n) = \sum_k \mathbb{1}_{[n_k, n_{k+1}[}(n)$. The value $g(n)$ gives the number of n_k's smaller than n. The function g has been built so as to satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{k\geq 1} B_k\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall n \geq 1,\ \#\mathrm{For}^*(\Theta, \mathbb{X}_\Theta) \cap ([-n;n]^d \times [0;1]) \geq g(n)\right) \ .$$

Finally, to conclude, it suffices to remark that $\cap_{k\geq 1} B_k$ occurs with probability larger than $\alpha - \sum_{k\geq 1} a_k$ which is equal to $\frac{\alpha}{2}$. □

5 Proof of Theorem 3.2

This section is devoted to the verifications of Loop and Shield assumptions for the **Line-segment model** and the **Navigation model**.

5.1 Line-segment model

Let us introduce some notations decribing the geometry of this model. Given a marked point $x = (\xi, u) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0;1]$, we denote by $l(x) = \{\xi + t\overrightarrow{u}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ the (semi-infinite) ray starting from ξ in the direction $\overrightarrow{u} = (\cos(2\pi u), \sin(2\pi u))$. Thus, let us set

$$l(\mathbb{X}) = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} l(x) \ .$$

For $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$, we denote by $h_g(\varphi, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the intersection point between $l(x)$ and $l(h(\varphi, x))$. Roughly speaking, $h_g(\varphi, x)$ represents the impact point of the stopped segment starting from ξ on the stopping segment starting from ξ', where $(\xi', \cdot) = h(\varphi, x)$.

5.1.1 Loop assumption

The goal of this section is to prove the following result.

Proposition 5.1 *With probability* 1, $\mathbb{X}$ *is a* 3*-looping configuration.*

Proof: Consider a configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and an element $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$. The first step consists in stating that only a finite number of growing segments are stopped by $[\xi; h_g(x, \varphi)]$. This will allow us to exhibit a small region close to the impact point $h_g(\varphi, x)$ where we could easily add a loop made up of 3 segments, that the growing segment x will hit. See Figure 5.

Let us introduce the set of marked points of φ which are stopped by x:

$$\mathrm{Back}^{-1}(\varphi, x) = \{y \in \varphi,\ h(\varphi, y) = x\} \ .$$

Lemma 5.1 *Let* $\mathscr{C}'' = \mathscr{C}' \cap \{\forall x \in \mathbb{X},\ \#Back^{-1}(\mathbb{X}, x) < \infty\}$. *Then* $\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{X} \in \mathscr{C}''] = 1$.

Proof: Since $\mathbb{P}[\mathbb{X} \in \mathscr{C}'] = 1$, any growing segment $x = (\xi, \cdot) \in \mathbb{X}$ is eventually stopped and the corresponding segment $[\xi; h_g(\mathbb{X}, x)]$ is a.s. included in a ball $B(0, n)$ for some (random) radius n. Hence, it suffices to show that, for any integer n, the number Z_n of marked points $y = (\eta, v) \in \mathbb{X} \setminus (B(0, n) \times [0, 1])$ such that the segment $[\eta; h_g(\mathbb{X}, y)]$ overlaps the ball $B(0, n)$ is a.s. finite.

To do it, we are going to prove that the r.v. Z_n admits a finite expectation. The Mecke formula allows us to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_n] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x=(\xi,u)\in\mathbb{X}\setminus(B(0,n)\times[0;1])} \mathbb{1}_{\{[\xi;h_g(\mathbb{X},x)]\cap B(0,n)\neq\emptyset\}}\right] \\
&= \sum_{R\in\mathbb{N},\ R\geq n} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathscr{C}_R\times[0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\{[\xi;h_g(\mathbb{X},x)]\cap B(0,n)\neq\emptyset\}}\ \lambda_2\otimes Q(dx)\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{R\in\mathbb{N},\ R\geq n} \int_{\mathscr{C}_R\times[0,1]} \mathbb{P}[\|\xi - h_g(\mathbb{X}, x)\| \geq R - \sqrt{2}n]\ \lambda_2\otimes Q(dx) \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{C}_R = B(0, R+1) \setminus B(0, R)$. Now, by stationarity of the line-segment model, it follows:

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\xi - h_g(\mathbb{X}, x)\| \geq R - \sqrt{2}n] = \mathbb{P}[\|h_g(\mathbb{X}_\Theta, \Theta)\| \geq R - \sqrt{2}n] \tag{19}$$

(let us recall that $\Theta = (0, U)$ is a typical point and $\mathbb{X}_\Theta = \mathbb{X} \cup \Theta$). In Theorem 4 of [11], Schreiber & Soja state that the length of a typical segment, i.e. $\|h_g(\mathbb{X}_\Theta, \Theta)\|$, admits an exponential tail decay. So, there exist constants $c, c' > 0$ such that (19) is smaller than $ce^{-c'R}$, for any integer R. Combining with the fact that $\lambda_2 \otimes Q\left(\mathscr{C}_R \times [0;1]\right)$ is of order R^2, the expected result follows. □

We are now able to prove Proposition 5.1. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}''$ and $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$. First recall that the impact point $h_g(\varphi, y)$ of a marked point $y \in \text{Back}^{-1}(\varphi, x)$ belongs to $[\xi; h_g(\varphi, x)]$. Since $\text{Back}^{-1}(\varphi, x)$ is finite, we can exhibit a positive real number r such that

$$[h_g(\varphi, x) - r\overrightarrow{u}; h_g(\varphi, x)] \cap \left\{h_g(\varphi, y),\ y \in \text{Back}^{-1}(\varphi, x)\right\} = \emptyset\ . \tag{20}$$

Let us set $w = h_g(\varphi, x) - \frac{r}{2}\overrightarrow{u}$. Statement (20) ensures the existence of a positive radius r' such that

$$\left(\bigcup_{y=(\eta,v)\in\varphi} [\eta; h_g(\varphi, y)]\right) \cap B(w, r') = \emptyset \tag{21}$$

on the one hand, and

$$2r' \leq \|\xi - w\|_2 - r' \tag{22}$$

on the other hand. The obtained ball $B(w, r')$ is actually a suitable region in which we could create an obstacle for the growing segment x without altering any other growing segment. Besides, condition (22) ensures that any marked point added in $B(w, r')$ could not be stopped by the growing segment x.



Figure 5: On this picture, the set $\text{Back}^{-1}(\varphi, x)$ is made up of marked points z_1 and z_2. The blue circle delimits the ball $B(w, r')$. It is worth pointing out here that $B(w, r')$ has to avoid any growing segment $y \in \mathbb{X}$, and not only $y \in \text{Back}^{-1}(\varphi, x)$. Because the added marked points (in red) have to stop the growing segment x without decreasing its backward.

Let us consider the set $\mathscr{A}_x$ of triplets $(x_0, x_1, x_2) \in (B(w, r') \times [0;1])^3$ such that:

(*i*) $h(x_i, \varphi \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_2\}) = x_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ (where the index $i+1$ is taken modulo 3);

(*ii*) The triangle defined by the vertices $h_g(x_i, \varphi \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_2\})$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, is included in $B(w, r')$ and contains the center w.

It is not difficult too see that $\mathscr{A}_x$ contains a non-empty open set $A_x \subset (B(w, r') \times [0; 1])^3$. When a triplet $(x_0, x_1, x_2) \in A_x$ is added to φ, then by (22), (*i*) and (*ii*), the growing segment x hits the loop produced by x_0, x_1, x_2:

$$\mathrm{For}(x, \varphi \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_2\}) = \{x, x_0, x_1, x_2\} \ .$$

Morever, condition (21) in conjunction with (*i*) and (*ii*) imply that no growing segment except x is changing by the adding marked points $\{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$:

$$\mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_2\}) = \mathrm{Back}(x, \varphi) \ .$$

This achieves the proof of Proposition 5.1. □

5.1.2 Shield assumption

In order to prove the Shield assumption, we need to construct building blocks called *shield hexagons* which together will formed uncrossable walls. To do it, let us start with introducing an hexagonal tessellation.

Let us consider the triangular lattice whose vertex set is

$$\Pi = \left\{ a \overrightarrow{i} + b \overrightarrow{j} \ : \ a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \ ,$$

where $\overrightarrow{i} = (\sqrt{3}.\cos(\frac{\pi}{6}), \sqrt{3}.\sin(\frac{\pi}{6}))$ and $\overrightarrow{j} = (0, \sqrt{3})$. The usual graph distance on Π is denoted by d_Π. We also denote resp. by $B^n(z)$ and $S^n(z)$ the (closed) ball and sphere with center z and radius n w.r.t. d_Π.

For any $z \in \Pi$, let $\mathrm{Hex}(z)$ be the Voronoi cell of z w.r.t. the vertex set Π:

$$\mathrm{Hex}(z) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^2, \ \|y - z\|_2 \leq \inf_{w \in \Pi \setminus \{z\}} \|y - w\|_2 \right\} .$$

The set $\mathrm{Hex}(z)$ is a regular hexagon centred at z. For any integer $n > 0$, let us introduce the hexagonal complex of size n centred in z as

$$\mathrm{Hex}^n(z) = \bigcup_{y \in B^n(z)} \mathrm{Hex}(y) \ .$$

Given $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we also set $\mathrm{Hex}^n(\xi) = \mathrm{Hex}^n(0) + \xi$. Finally, for any integer $n > 0$, we define the hexagonal ring $C_n(\xi)$ by $C_n(\xi) = \mathrm{Hex}^n(\xi) \setminus \mathrm{Hex}^{n-1}(\xi)$ (with $\mathrm{Hex}^0(\cdot) = \emptyset$).

Let us now specify the regions on which depend the growing segments. Let $x = (\xi, u) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0; 1]$ and $r > 0$. Here, the crucial point is to remark that the indicator function

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\xi - h_g(\mathbb{X} \cup \{x\}, x)\| \leq r\}}$$

is $\mathscr{S}_{B(\xi+r\overrightarrow{u},r)}$-measurable: see Figure 6. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and Λ be an open bounded region in $\mathbb{R}^2$. For each marked point $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi_\Lambda$, we set

$$r(x,\Lambda) = \sup\{r \geq 0,\ B(\xi + r\overrightarrow{u}, r) \subset \Lambda\} \ .$$

Hence, for all $r \leq r(x,\Lambda)$, it is possible to know when we observe the configuration φ only through the window Λ if $\|\xi - h_g(\varphi, x)\|$ is smaller than r or not. Henceforth, we define the *decision set* of the growing segment x through Λ as

$$D_\Lambda(x) = B(\xi + r(x,\Lambda)\overrightarrow{u}, r(x,\Lambda)) \ .$$



Figure 6: The set Λ is a regular hexagon. The decision set $D_\Lambda(x)$ is delimited by a red circle. It contains two marked points $y_1, y_2 \in \varphi$ which could stop the growing segment x before $\xi + r(x,\Lambda)u$. To check it, it is enough to observe the configuration φ inside the blue dashed circles which are themselves included in $D_\Lambda(x)$.

So, for a given marked point $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi_\Lambda$, two situations may occur. If the stopping vertex of x in φ belongs to the decision set $D_\Lambda(x)$ then the whole segment $[\xi, h_g(\varphi, x)]$ is observed knowing φ_Λ. In this case, we set $f_\Lambda(\varphi, x) = h_g(\varphi, x)$. Otherwise, we can only assert that the line-segment x will be longer than $r(x,\Lambda)$. In that case, $f_\Lambda(\varphi, x) = \xi + r(x,\Lambda)\overrightarrow{u}$. In both situations,

$$[\xi; f_\Lambda(\varphi, x)] \subset [\xi; h_g(\varphi, x)] \ .$$

The previous considerations lead to the next result:

Lemma 5.2 *With the above notations, the following random set is $\mathscr{S}_\Lambda$-measurable:*

$$\mathscr{G}_\Lambda(\varphi) = \bigcup_{x \in \varphi_\Lambda} [\xi; f_\Lambda(\varphi, x)] \ .$$

We can now introduce the central notion of shield hexagons.

Definition 5.1 *Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$, $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The hexagon $Hex(\xi)$ is said ϵ-shield for φ if for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $a \notin Hex(\xi)$ and $b \in \xi + \epsilon Hex(0)$, we have*

$$(a; b) \cap \mathscr{G}_{Hex(\xi)}(\varphi) \neq \emptyset \ .$$

Moreover, for any integer $n > 0$ and $\{z_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \subset \Pi$, the collection $\{Hex(z_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is said ϵ-shield for φ if for each index i, $Hex(z_i)$ is ϵ-shield for φ.

In other words, the hexagon $\mathrm{Hex}(\xi)$ is ϵ-shield (for φ) whenever the set $\mathscr{G}_{\mathrm{Hex}(\xi)}(\varphi)$ produces a barrier in the strip $\mathrm{Hex}(\xi) \setminus (\xi + \epsilon\mathrm{Hex}(0))$ disconnecting the inside part $\xi + \epsilon\mathrm{Hex}(0)$ from the outside part $\mathrm{Hex}(\xi)^c$. For this purpose, it is not difficult to be convinced (using many small segments, all the smaller as $\epsilon \to 1$) that this event occurs with positive probability:

$$\forall \epsilon \in (0;1),\ p_\epsilon = \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Hex}(0) \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-shield}\right] > 0\ . \tag{23}$$

The notion of decision sets $D_\Lambda(\cdot)$– and also $\mathscr{G}_\Lambda(\cdot)$ –have been introduced to use the independence property of the Poisson point process $\mathbb{X}$. Indeed, by Lemma 5.2, for any vertices $z \neq z^{'} \in \Pi$, the hexagons $\mathrm{Hex}(z)$ and $\mathrm{Hex}(z')$ are independently ϵ-shield.

The next step consists in using ϵ-shield hexagons as building blocks to create obstacles. Precisely:

Definition 5.2 *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be an integer and $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^{'}$ a marked configuration. Any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is said m-shielded for φ if:*

($\clubsuit$) *For all $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi_{Hex^{2m}(\eta)^c}$, $[\xi; h_g(\varphi, x)] \cap Hex^m(\eta) = \emptyset$;*

($\spadesuit$) *For all $x \in \varphi_{Hex^m(\eta)}$, $h_g(\varphi, x) \in Hex^{2m}(\eta)$.*

If η is m-shielded for φ then conditions ($\clubsuit$) and ($\spadesuit$) roughly asserts that it is impossible for a growing segment to cross $\mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(\eta) \setminus \mathrm{Hex}^m(\eta)$ respectively from the outside part $\mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(\eta)^c$ and from the inside part $\mathrm{Hex}^m(\eta)$.

In the sequel, we will establish the existence of an event $E_m \in \mathscr{S}_{Hex^{2m}(0)}$ such that, on E_m, 0 is a.s. m-shielded (Proposition 5.2). Actually, it will be required to get the event E_m that $\mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(0) \setminus \mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$ contains many ϵ-shield hexagons. In a second time, we will prove that the probability of E_m tends to 1 as $m \to \infty$ (Proposition 5.3).

Let us introduce some notations needed to define the event E_m. Let $\eta \in \partial\mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$ where $\partial\Lambda$ denotes the topological boundary of $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. For any $v \in [0;1]$, we define the (semi-infinite) ray starting from η in the direction $\overrightarrow{v} = (\cos(2\pi v), \sin(2\pi v))$ by $l(\eta, \overrightarrow{v}) = \{\eta + t\overrightarrow{v}, t \geq 0\}$. Thus, we denote by $\mathscr{L}^m$ the set of rays $l(\eta, \overrightarrow{v})$ coming from $\partial\mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$ which do not overlap the topological interior of $\mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$:

$$\mathscr{L}^m = \{l(\eta, \overrightarrow{v}),\ l(\eta, \overrightarrow{v}) \cap \mathrm{Int}(\mathrm{Hex}^m(0)) = \emptyset \text{ and } (\eta, v) \in \partial\mathrm{Hex}^m(0) \times [0;1]\}\ .$$

For each ray $l \in \mathscr{L}^m$, let us consider the set of hexagons included in $\mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(0) \setminus \mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$ and crossed by l:

$$\mathrm{Cross}(l) = \{\mathrm{Hex}(z),\ m+1 \leq d_\Pi(0,z) \leq 2m \text{ and } l \cap \mathrm{Hex}(z) \neq \emptyset\}\ .$$

This set can be partitioned into different floors $\mathrm{Cross}_i(l)$, for $m+1 \leq i \leq 2m$, where $\mathrm{Cross}_i(l)$ denotes the set of hexagons of $\mathrm{Cross}(l)$ included in $C_i(0)$. We can observe that, for each $l \in \mathscr{L}^m$, there exists $m+1 \leq i(l) \leq 2m$ such that for all $i(l) \leq i \leq 2m$, $\mathrm{Cross}_i(l)$ contains at most three hexagons.
Thus, the set $\mathrm{Cross}(l)$ is said ϵ-*uncrossable* for φ if we can find two consecutive floors $\mathrm{Cross}_i(l)$ and $\mathrm{Cross}_{i+1}(l)$, for some index $i(l) \leq i \leq 2m-1$, which are both ϵ-shield for φ. We can then define the event E_m as:

$$E_m(\epsilon) = \bigcap_{l \in \mathscr{L}^m} \{\mathrm{Cross}(l) \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-uncrossable for } \mathbb{X}\} \tag{24}$$

which is $\mathscr{S}_{Hex^{2m}(0)}$-measurable by construction.

Proposition 5.2 *There exists $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ (close to 1) such that, a.s. on the event $E_m(\epsilon)$, 0 is m-shielded.*

defin:Shielded

Proof: Assume that the event $E_m(\epsilon)$ is satisfied. Then, to prove that 0 is m-shielded, i.e. to prove (♣) and (♠), it is enough to state that any ray $l \in \mathscr{L}^m$ crosses the inside part $z + \epsilon \mathrm{Hex}(0)$ of an ϵ-shield hexagon $\mathrm{Hex}(z)$.

Let us consider a ray $l \in \mathscr{L}^m$ and a vertex $z \in B_{2m}(0) \setminus B_{i(l)-1}(0)$. Let us define $d_{z,l}$ as follows:

$$d_{z,l} = \sup_{x \in l \cap \mathrm{Hex}(z)} d(x, \partial \mathrm{Hex}(z))$$

and $d_{z,l} = 0$ if $l \cap \mathrm{Hex}(z)$ is empty (where the above distance d is euclidean). Thus, we set

$$\gamma = \inf_{l \in \mathscr{L}^m} \sup\{d_{z,l}\,,\ z \in B_n(0) \setminus B_{i(l)-1}(0) \text{ and } \mathrm{Hex}(z) \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-shield}\}\ .$$

On the event $E_m(\epsilon)$, any ray l crosses two consecutive ϵ-shield floors. Hence, the hexagonal construction ensures that the above infimum γ is positive (see Figure 7). So, $\epsilon = 1 - \gamma/2$ is suitable. □



Figure 7: Here is a ray $l \in \mathscr{L}^m$ (in red) starting at $\partial \mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$ and crossing two consecutive ϵ-shield floors, say $\mathrm{Cross}_i(l)$ and $\mathrm{Cross}_{i+1}(l)$. Each hexagon $\mathrm{Hex}(z)$ belonging to these two floors has its inside part, i.e. $z + \epsilon \mathrm{Hex}(0)$, colored in blue. As this picture suggests, when ϵ is close to 1, it becomes impossible for the ray l to avoid the inside parts of hexagons of two consecutive floors.

In the sequel, we merely write E_m instead of $E_m(\epsilon)$ where ϵ is given by Proposition 5.2. Its probability tends to 1 with m;

Proposition 5.3 *The probability of the event E_m tends to 1 as m tends to $+\infty$.*

Proof: First, let us reduce the infinite intersection defining the event E_m in (24) to a finite one. Let $z \in S^{m+1}(0)$ and $z' \in S^{2m}(0)$. Let us consider the set $\mathrm{Cross}(z,z')$ made up of hexagons $\mathrm{Hex}(z'')$, $z'' \in \Pi$, which are crossed by a ray $l \in \mathscr{L}^m$ starting at some $\eta \in \partial\mathrm{Hex}(z)$ and exiting $\mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(0)$ through $\mathrm{Hex}(z')$. As previously, we divide the set $\mathrm{Cross}(z,z')$ into different floors $\mathrm{Cross}_i(z,z')$, for $m+1 \le i \le 2m$, where $\mathrm{Cross}_i(z,z')$ denotes the set of hexagons of $\mathrm{Cross}(z,z')$ included in $C_i(0)$.
There exists $m+1 \le i(z,z') \le 2m$ such that for all $i(z,z') \le i \le 2m$, $\mathrm{Cross}_i(z,z')$ contains at most three hexagons.Thus, $\mathrm{Cross}(z,z')$ is said ϵ-*uncrossable* for $\mathbb{X}$ if we can find two consecutive floors $\mathrm{Cross}_i(z,z')$ and $\mathrm{Cross}_{i+1}(z,z')$, for some index $i(l) \le i \le 2m-1$, which are both ϵ-shield for $\mathbb{X}$. Hence,

$$\bigcap_{z\in S^{m+1}(0), z'\in S^{2m}(0)} \{\mathrm{Cross}(z,z') \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-uncrossable for } \mathbb{X}\} \subset E_m \ . \tag{25}$$

Since $S^{m+1}(0) \times S^{2m}(0)$ contains $36(m+1)(2m)$ vertices, the expected result follows from the inclusion (25) and the limit: for m sufficiently large, for all $z \in S^{m+1}(0)$ and $z' \in S^{2m}(0)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Cross}(z,z') \text{ is not } \epsilon\text{-uncrossable for } \mathbb{X}\right] \le (1-p_\epsilon^6)^{\frac{m}{10}} \ , \tag{26}$$

where $p_\epsilon = \mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Hex}(0) \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-shield}]$.

We obtain

$$\{\mathrm{Cross}(z,z^{'}) \text{ is not } \epsilon - \text{uncrossable for } \mathbb{X}\} \subset \bigcap_{k=i(z,z')}^{2m-1} U_k$$

where $U_k = \{\mathrm{Cross}_k(z,z') \text{ and } \mathrm{Cross}_{k+1}(z,z') \text{ are } \epsilon - \text{ shield for } \mathbb{X}\}^c$.
To obtain an independence property under the Poisson point process law, we need to consider disjoint subsets of hexagons:

$$T_m = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{2m-1-i(z,z')}{2} \rfloor} U_{i(z,z')+2k}.$$

The events $(U_{2k})_k$ are mutually independent and

$$\{\mathrm{Cross}(z,z^{'}) \text{ is not } \epsilon - \text{uncrossable for } \mathbb{X}\} \subset T_m.$$

We have introduced in (23) the probability $p_\epsilon = \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Hex}(0) \text{ is } \epsilon - \text{shield for } \mathbb{X}\right]$. Then, for $i(z,z') \le k \le 2m$, we have $\mathbb{P}[U_k] \le 1-p_\epsilon^6$. It is relatively easy to check that, for m sufficiently large, for all $(z,z') \in S^{m+1}(0) \times S^{2m}(0)$, we have: $\lfloor \frac{2m-1-i(z,z')}{2} \rfloor + 1 \ge \frac{m}{10}$. It implies the existence of a bound for $\mathbb{P}[T_m]$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[T_m\right] \le (1-p_\epsilon^6)^{\frac{m}{10}}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Cross}(z,z^{'}) \text{ is not } \epsilon - \text{shield for } \mathbb{X}\right] \le (1-p_\epsilon^6)^{\frac{m}{10}}.$$

□

From now on, we claim that:

Proposition 5.4 *The line-segment model satisfies the Shield assumption for* $\alpha = 32$ *and* $\mathscr{E}_m = E_m \cap E_{2m}$.

Proof: We have to check that the line-segment model satisfies the three items of the Shield assumption. By definition, the event $\mathscr{E}_m = E_m \cap E_{2m} \in \mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{Hex}^{4m}(0)}$. Item (i) follows from the fact that any $\eta \in \mathrm{Hex}^{4m}(0)$ satisfies $\|\eta\| \leq 4m\sqrt{3} + 1 \leq 8m$. Item (ii) is given by Proposition 5.3. So, it only remains to check Item (iii).

For this purpose, let us consider three disjoint subsets V, A_1, A_2 of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that ∂A_1 and ∂A_2 are included in V. Let also for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \left(A_i \oplus [\frac{-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^2 \right) \setminus (V \oplus [-\alpha, \alpha]^2) \ .$$

Thus, let m be a positive integer and $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathscr{C}'$ such that $\tau_{-mz}(\varphi) \in \mathscr{E}_m$, for all $z \in V$. We have to check that

$$\forall x \in \varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_1},\ h(\varphi, x) = h(\bar{\varphi}, x) \ , \tag{27}$$

where $\bar{\varphi}$ denotes the configuration $\varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_2^c} \cup \varphi'_{m\mathcal{A}_2}$. The reason why (27) holds can be roughly expressed as follows. The replacement of the configuration φ with $\bar{\varphi}$, which actually concerns only the set $m\mathcal{A}_2$, may generate some modifications in the graph on the set $m\mathcal{A}_2^c$ but not beyond the obstacle mV. Then, the graph on $m\mathcal{A}_1$ is preserved.

Let us start with splitting the set $m\mathcal{A}_2^c$ into three disjoint subsets: $m\mathcal{A}_1$, Shield $:= mV \oplus \mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(0)$ and Bound $:= (mV \oplus [-\alpha m; \alpha m]^2) \setminus$ Shield. Since $mV \oplus \mathrm{Hex}^{4m}(0)$ is included in Bound and $\mathscr{E}_m$ is $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{Hex}^{4m}(0)}$-measurable then

$$\forall z \in V,\ \tau_{-mz}(\bar{\varphi}) \in \mathscr{E}_m \ . \tag{28}$$

In other words, the shield structure of vertices mz, $z \in V$, is preserved when passing from φ to $\bar{\varphi}$. Hence, any $x = (\xi, \cdot) \in \varphi_{\mathrm{Shield}}$ belongs to a set $\mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(mz)$ where $mz \in mV$ is $2m$-shielded (thanks to E_{2m}). Property (♠) of Definition 5.2 then ensures that $h_g(\varphi, x)$ is in $mz \oplus \mathrm{Hex}^{4m}(0)$, i.e. $\|\xi - h_g(\varphi, x)\| \leq \mathrm{diam}\, \mathrm{Hex}^{4m}(0) \leq 16m$. To sum up, for all $x \in \varphi_{\mathrm{Shield}}$,

$$B(h_g(\varphi, x), \|\xi - h_g(\varphi, x)\|) \subset mV \oplus [-32m; 32m]^2 \ .$$

The above inclusion justifies the choice $\alpha = 32$. It also ensures that the replacement of φ with φ' outside of $mV \oplus [-32m; 32m]^2$ does not impact the geometric edges starting from vertices of $\varphi_{\mathrm{Shield}}$. So,

$$\forall x \in \varphi_{\mathrm{Shield}},\ h(\bar{\varphi}, x) = h(\varphi, x) \ . \tag{29}$$

It then remains to show that (27) is a consequence of (28) and (29). When passing from φ to $\bar{\varphi}$, the line-segment of a marked point $x \in \varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_2^c}$ can be modified in two different ways:

- Either the line-segment of x is shorter for $\bar{\varphi}$ than for φ, i.e. x admits a new outgoing neighbor y.
- Or the line-segment of x is longer for $\bar{\varphi}$ than for φ, i.e. its original stopping line-segment has been stopped before by some marked point y.

In both cases, we say that the marked point y modifies x. It belongs to $\varphi'_{m\mathcal{A}_2}$, or to $\varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_2^c}$ but with the condition that $h(\varphi, y) \neq h(\bar{\varphi}, y)$. Hence, from any $x_0 \in \varphi'_{m\mathcal{A}_2}$, may start a sequence of marked points $(x_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ such that x_i modifies x_{i+1}. Now, (28) and (29) prevents such sequence to cross the set Shield $= mV \oplus \mathrm{Hex}^{2m}(0)$. By contradiction, let us assume that $x_n \in m\mathcal{A}_1$. Since (29) prevents the x_i's to belong to Shield, it necessarily exists an index $0 \leq i_0 < n$ such that the line-segment of x_{i_0} crosses $mV \oplus \mathrm{Hex}^m(0)$. But this is forbidden by (28): each mz, for $z \in V$, is m-shielded (thanks to E_m). So Property (♣) of Definition 5.2 applies. □

5.2 Navigation model

Let $0 < \epsilon < \frac{\pi}{2}$. Given a configuration $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$, let us recall that the stopping vertex of $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$ is the closest element of $\varphi_{\text{germs}} \cap C(x)$ to ξ, where

$$C(x) = \{(r\cos(\alpha), r\sin(\alpha));\ r > 0 \ \text{ and } \ |\alpha - 2\pi u| < \epsilon\} \ .$$

If $(\eta, v) = h(\varphi, x)$ then the impact point of x in the Navigation model is $h_g(\varphi, x) = \eta$.

5.2.1 Loop assumption

The Navigation model satisfies the Loop assumption.

Proposition 5.5 *Each configuration of $\mathscr{C}'$ is $1-$looping.*

Proof: Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ and $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$. Let us introduce the stopped cone starting from x:

$$C_{\text{stop}}(x) = \{(r\cos(\alpha), r\sin(\alpha));\ 0 < r < \|\xi - h_g(\varphi, x)\| \ \text{ and } \ |\alpha - 2\pi u| < \epsilon\} \ .$$

Hence, $C_{\text{stop}}(x) \cap \varphi_{\text{germs}} = \emptyset$. Let $d_x > 0$ small enough so that $\varphi_{B(\xi, d_x)}$ only contains the point ξ. Thus, let us consider an open ball $A_x \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0;1]$ such that any marked point $y = (\eta, v) \in A_x$ satisfies $\eta \in B(\xi, d_x) \cap C_{stop}(x)$ and $\xi \in C(y)$. Thenceforth, we get $h(\varphi \cup \{y\}, x) = y$ and $h(\varphi \cup \{y\}, y) = x$ (see Figure 8) which respectively imply

$$\text{For}(x, \varphi \cup \{y\}) = \{x, y\} \ \text{ and } \ \text{Back}(x, \varphi) \cup \{y\} \subset \text{Back}(x, \varphi \cup \{y\}) \ .$$

Let us justify this latter inclusion. It is possible that η belongs to the stopped cone $C_{\text{stop}}(z)$ (w.r.t. φ) of a given marked point $z \in \varphi$, which forces $h(\varphi \cup \{y\}, z) = y$. Since y belongs to $\text{Back}(x, \varphi \cup \{y\})$, the same holds for z. If z was already in the backward of x (for φ), it is still in (but for $\varphi \cup \{y\}$). See Figure 8. □



Figure 8: The adding of the marked point y breaks the edges from x to $h(\varphi, x)$, and from z to x. However, for the configuration $\varphi \cup \{y\}$, z is still in the backward of x.

5.2.2 Shield assumption

Let us split the square $[-m;m]^2$ into $\kappa = (2\lfloor m^{1/2} \rfloor)^2$ congruent subsquares $Q_1^m, \ldots, Q_\kappa^m$ ($\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the integer part). Each of these subsquares has an area equal to

$$\left(\frac{2m}{2\lfloor m^{1/2} \rfloor} \right)^2 ,$$

i.e. of order m. Thus, we define the event $\mathscr{E}_m$ as follows:

$$\mathscr{E}_m = \bigcap_{1 \le i \le \kappa} \left\{ \#\mathbb{X}_{Q_i^m} \ge 1 \right\} .$$

Proposition 5.6 *For $\alpha = 1$, the Navigation model satisfies the Shield assumption w.r.t. the family of events $(\mathscr{E}_m)_{m \ge 1}$.*



Figure 9: Black points are vertices mz for $z \in V$. The event $\mathscr{E}_m$ realized on each $z \oplus [-m;m]^2$ provides a shield between $m\mathcal{A}_1$ and $m\mathcal{A}_2$. Indeed, the cone $C_{\text{stop}}(x)$ cannot overlap $m\mathcal{A}_2$ without containing a subsquare $z + Q_i^m$.

Proof: Let us first remark that the event $\mathscr{E}_m$ is $\mathscr{S}_{[-m,m]^2}$-measurable and its probability tends to 1. So the first two items of the Shield assumption are satisfied with $\alpha = 1$.

Let us focus on Item (iii). Hence, let us consider $V, A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that the topological conditions of the shield assumption occur. Let us set

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \left(A_i \oplus [\frac{-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^2 \right) \setminus (V \oplus [-\alpha, \alpha]^2)$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}'$ satisfying $\varphi - mz \in \mathscr{E}_m$, for any vertex $z \in V$. Let $x = (\xi, u) \in \varphi$ be a marked point whose first coordinate belongs to $m\mathcal{A}_i$. If the cone $C(x)$ does not overlap $m\mathcal{A}_j$, with $j = 3 - i$, then the outgoing vertex $h(\varphi, x)$ does not depend on possible changes on $\varphi_{m\mathcal{A}_j}$. From now on, let us assume that $C(x) \cap m\mathcal{A}_j$ is not empty (see Figure 9). It is then sufficient to remark that for any $m \ge m_0(\epsilon)$, the stopped cone $C_{\text{stop}}(x)$ does not overlap $m\mathcal{A}_j$. Otherwise, for m large enough, it would contain at least one subsquare $z + Q_i^m$ for some $z \in V$

and $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$ and so at least a marked point (since $\varphi - mz \in \mathscr{E}_m$) which is forbidden. Hence, as previously, the outgoing vertex $h(\varphi, x)$ remains unchanged whatever the configuration φ inside $m\mathcal{A}_j$. □

5.2.3 Acknowledgement

The authors thank C. Hirsch, G. Last and S. Zuyev for fruitful discussions on this problem. This work was supported in part by the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01) and by the CNRS GdR 3477 GeoSto.

References

[1] N. Bonichon and J.-F. Marckert. Asymptotics of geometrical navigation on a random set of points in the plane. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 43(4):899–942, 2011.

[2] D. Coupier and V. C. Tran. The 2D-directed spanning forest is almost surely a tree. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 42(1):59–72, 2013.

[3] D. Daley, S. Ebert, and G. Last. Two lilypond systems of finite line-segments. *To appear in Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 2014.

[4] D. Daley and G. Last. Descending chains, the lilypond model, and mutual-nearest-neighbour matching. *Advances in applied probability*, pages 604–628, 2005.

[5] O. Häggström and R. Meester. Nearest neighbor and hard sphere models in continuum percolation. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 9(3):295–315, 1996.

[6] C. Hirsch. On the absence of percolation in a line-segment based lilypond model. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 52(1):127–145, 2016.

[7] G. Last and S. Ebert. On a class of growth-maximal hard-core processes. *Stochastic Models*, 31:153–184, 2013.

[8] G. Last and M. Penrose. Percolation and limit theory for the poisson lilypond model. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 42(2):226–249, 2013.

[9] T. Liggett, R. Schonmann, and A. Stacey. Domination by product measures. *The Annals of Probability*, 25(1):71–95, 1997.

[10] M. Penrose. *Random geometric graphs*, volume 5 of *Oxford Studies in Probability*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.

[11] T. Schreiber and N. Soja. Limit theory for planar gilbert tessellations. *Probab. Math. Statist*, 2010.